

Reauthorization Subcommittee Meeting
Draft Meeting Minutes
Get On It Conference Room, Kilroy Building, Sea Tac
May 4, 2006, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.

Initial if

Present	Name	Organization	Phone	e-mail
<i>Subcommittee Members</i>				
RSE	Rodney Eng (Lead)	City of Seattle	206-684-8241	rodney.eng.@seattle.gov
DRA	Dan Absher	Absher Construction	253-845-9544	dra@abshernw.com
Absent	Butch Reifert	Design Industry	206-441-4151	breifert@mahlum.com
Absent	Rocky Sharp	Electrical Contractor	253-383-4546	rsharp@madsenelectric.com
EK	Ed Kommers	Mechanical Contractors	206-612-7304	ekommers@comcast.net
Absent	Dave Johnson	WA State Bldg. & Construction Trades Council	360-357-6778	DJIW86@aol.com
JP	John Palewicz	UW	206-221-4223	palewicz@u.washington.edu
JL	John Lynch	General Administration	360-902-7227	jlynch@ga.wa.gov
Absent	Wendy Keller	Public Hospital Project Review Board	206-684-1912	Wendy.Keller@metrokc.gov
Absent	Tom Peterson	Hoffman Construction	206-286-8697	tom-peterson@hoffmancorp.com
Absent	Ashley Probart	Assoc of WA Cities	360-753-4137	ashleyp@awcnet.org
Absent	Dick Lutz	Centennial Contractors	360-867-9443	dicklutz@comcast.net
Absent	Larry Stevens	NECA/MCA	253-212-1536	lwstevens@wwbd.org
Absent	Paul Berry	Former City of Seattle Employee	206-772-1772	pnberry1@earthlink.net
Absent	Steve Goldblatt	University of Washington	206-685-1676	bconbear@u.washington.edu
SB	Stan Bowman	AIA WA Council	360-943-6012	bowman@aiawa.org
Absent	G.S. "Duke" Schaub	Associated General Contractors	360-352-5000	dschaub@agcwa.gov
<i>Other Attendees</i>				
Absent	Michael Mequet	Port of Seattle	(206) 835-7632	Mequet.m@portseattle.org
ND	Nancy Deakins	General Administration	360-902-8161	deakink@dshs.wa.gov
Absent	Lyle Martin	Hoffman Construction	206-286-6697	Lyle-martin@hoffmancorp.com
Absent	Dick Goldsmith	AWPHD	206-216-2528	richardg@awphd.org
Absent	Michael Transue	AGC	253-223-2508	Cmjtransue@comcast.net
Absent	Dan Vaught	School District Project Review Board	425-489-6447	dvaught@nsd.org
Absent	Ginger Eagle	WA Public Ports Assoc.	360-943-0760	geagle@washingtonports.org
CH	Chris Hirst	Preston Gates & Ellis	206-370-8336	chirst@prestongates.com
MR	Marsha Reilly	House of Reps	360-786-7135	Reilly.marsha@leg.wa.gov

KL	Kathryn Leathers	House of Reps	360-786-7114	Leathers.kathryn@leg.wa.gov
DS	Diane Smith	Senate Gov Ops	360-786-7410	Smith.diane@leg.wa.gov
NH	Nora Huey	King County	206-684-2049	Nora.huey@metrokc.gov
MG	Mike Grace	Groff Murphy	206-628-9500	mgrace@groffmurphy.com

The meeting began at approximately 1:35 p.m.

Item 1: Introductions and Opening Remarks by the Lead

We went around the table and everyone introduced themselves individually. Rodney suggested that we follow the same format we have followed in previous meetings; hear from all three task force groups.

Item 2: Task Force #1 (Owner)

Lead: Stan Bowman (Two Handouts)

Handout 1

- 1.a. when it refers to alternative public works, it is referring to GC/CM and DB only, John Lynch said that it could be all three. Stan said that it is sought as the same application/process
 - Stan stated in regards to the procurement community it is close enough to typical procurement, so they would not have much concern
 - Two processes: (1) public entities – have existing authority, just review-but advisory only – non-binding, (2) no current authority – board would make a binding decision
- 2.a. The permanent board members are: i., ii, iii, iv, v (common to all projects, therefore should be permanent appointees to the board. Then as school projects come up will pull someone from the schools to sit on the board for that specific time frame).
- 2c. If involved in project, would have to remove self from the review
- 3. Rodney stated: Approve Project and public body for each project, especially true for those who have not done it (owners)
- 3a. projects and for public bodies; not grandfathered (re: review and approve)
- 3b. grandfathered (re: review and recommend some suggested review and comment, because we are not putting forth a recommendation)
- 5biii. RCW 39.10.XX and 5biv. RCW 39.10.YY (will get resolved through the regular CPARB)

Dan stated that there should be approval of owner and project:

- Or approval of owner?
- Or approval of project?
- If not, we are setting up a system with more risk

Handout 2: Criteria for Utilization of GC/CM Contracting Procedures

Rodney stated that this conflicts with the Expansion Subcommittee and Reauthorization Subcommittee Task Force #1 – these groups should get together and discuss this.

- There should be six or seven individuals on the board
- What would be a quorum?
- Appointment of two each (so there is back up for the permanent board members)

- Board members seem to be tailored towards GC/CM, there should be members with expertise in DB

Task Force #1 – subcommittee recommendation only on A/E is part of GC/CM selection team.

Motion by Dan Absher, seconded by Ed Kommers, none opposed, motion carried: Reauthorization Subcommittee agreed to a Central Review Board.

This Board will review GC/CM and DB (one opposed, motion carried)

Dan moved someone else seconded: Board will review and approve projects and public bodies for those entities (not grandfathered in). If not listed in 39.10 (not grandfathered), it is listed in statute. As applied to DB, none opposed.

Rodney stated that we need to start drafting this whole thing and see all the pieces together (3b, Page 1 of 2 handout).

Some are concerned about the word recommend (review and approve and review and recommend – both project and project team).

- Four subcommittee members agreed, Three opposed – definitely not a consensus

Dan stated that there shouldn't be a different treatment for grandfathered and non-grandfathered. Just one body regardless of if doing it now or not doing it now. The board should review and recommend and set up a system that could be a disaster in a couple of years.

Rodney said at this point, there is no consensus.

Dan moved to exclude JOC from this board, seconded by Ed Kommers, none opposed.

Item 2: Task Force #2 (MACC)

Lead: John Palewicz (Five-page Handout).

The group met Tuesday and looking at the four issues on Page 1 of this handout (Issues 1, 4, 6 and 9).

Note: Pages 2, 3 and 4 of this handout are the proposed language

Page 1: Issue 1

Prohibiting Savings Incentives

Moved and seconded, none opposed. Option 1 has been passed (agreed upon by the Reauthorization subcommittee).

Page 1, Issue 4

Rodney said that the concept is not captured in your language on page 3 of this handout. MACC only may be negotiated when design of project is sufficiently

completed (at 90%). How much specificity can we put into the statute? Is it the best practice a formal sanction? Is it a rule? How do we put the rubber to the road?

Page 1, Issue 6

John P stated that this is not a major stopping point

Rodney said that it is not a barrier to reauthorization, may go on a further study list.

Page 1 Issue 9

Rolls into Issue 4

Item 3: Task Force #3 (Contractor)

Lead: Ed Kommers

Some accepted and some items will go on the list of discussion items.

Prequalification's - narrow exceptions; eligibility not being used – used responsibility criteria and special cases a responsibility criterion does not work.

Ed accepted the timeline of one week, but needs to work on the list of discussion items and prioritize them for Rodney and next CPARB meeting.

Item 4: Next Steps

Task forces should schedule early and often, try to set up your meetings, crunch time for board recommendations.

John L said he is pleased with the consensus in this Reauthorization Subcommittee thus far. Rodney stated that he believes that we are making process.

Item 5: Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 3:30 p.m.